

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-81 are pending in the Application.

Claims 1-81 are rejected by the Examiner.

Reconsideration of the present Application is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Specification

The Examiner has reminded Applicant that an abstract is generally limited to a single paragraph, on a single sheet, within the range of 50 to 150 words. The abstract of the present application has been amended and is presently limited to 150 words. Therefore, Applicant submits that the abstract of the present application is of a proper format and is suitable.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as “not presentable”. Applicant has included herewith formal drawings and thus deems the objection overcome.

Claims

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 29, 53 and 75 Rejection Over Cited Art

Claims 1, 29, 54 (amended 53) and 76 (amended 75) stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,199,077 to Inala in view of United States Patent No. 6,442,601 to Grampper et al.

Applicant traverses these rejections, and deems them overcome, for at least the reasons stated forth hereinbelow.

Examiner states that Inala teaches:

“extracting organizational information from at least two service providers to form at least two organizational informational protocols, wherein one organizational information protocol corresponds to each of the at least two service providers”

and that Grampper teaches:

“writing the second plurality of information to the second at least one of the at least two service providers according to the organizational information protocol correspondent to the second at least one of the at least two service providers.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Inala and Grampper each fail to teach the formation of at least two organizational information protocols as occurs in the present invention. The present invention includes the steps of extracting organizational information from at least two service providers to form at least two organizational information protocols, according to the informational protocol correspondent to the first at least one of the at least two service providers, of a first plurality of information related to the user. Further, the present invention requires an accessing a second at least one of the at least two service providers upon selection of the migration selection interface by the user, and the writing of the first plurality of information to the second at least one of the at least two service providers according to the organizational information protocol (see page 11, lines 12-25 and page 12, lines 1-2 of the present specification)

wherein the organizational information protocol extracted during the extracting step would include the organizational setup of all information gathered from the at least two service providers. (see page 13, lines 15 – 19). In other words, the present invention extracts both substantive information and the organizational protocol from a first location, reformats the substantive information in accordance with a different organizational protocol, and writes the reformatted information to a new location.

In contrast, Grampper not only fails to teach the writing of the first plurality of information to the second at least one of the at least two service providers according to the organizational information protocol, **Grampper fails to teach the use of any organizational information protocol.** Grampper merely teaches the writing of large indiscriminate block files for the purpose of storing large volumes of information.

Grampper states:

In yet further embodiments, the minimum file size for migration is set to a value, such that the aggregate estimated number of file requests per unit of time for files larger than the minimum file size for migration does not exceed a processing capacity of the secondary storage, i.e., the number of file requests per unit of time that the secondary storage can process. (column 2, lines 59-65).

In contrast, the present invention teaches the writing of information gathered by specific protocol according to that specific protocol. In other words, the present invention does not read and write indiscriminate blocks of information, it writes to a second service provider at least one discrete segment of information that has been identified by using the organizational information protocol. Since neither Grampper nor Inala, alone or in combination, teach the claim limitations of the present invention, the combination of Grampper and Inala cannot render obvious Claims 1, 29, 53 and 75 of the present invention. *MPEP 706.02(j) (... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim limitations).* Consequently, Applicant traverses the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and respectfully requests their reconsideration and removal. Thus, Applicant asserts that independent Claims 1, 29, 53 and 75 are in a condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

In addition, Applicant asserts that dependent Claims 2 - 28, 30 - 52 and 53 - 74 and 76 - 81 are likewise in a condition for allowance by virtue of the ultimate dependence on independent Claims 1, 29, 53 and 75.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application in light of the reasons set forth herein, and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

REED SMITH LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'TJ McWilliams', written over a horizontal line.

Thomas J. McWilliams
Registration No. 44,930
Edward F. Behm Jr.
Registration No. 52,606
2500 One Liberty Place
1650 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7301
(215) 241-7939

Date: October 15, 2004

Attorneys for Applicant